UNITED NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2913
27 March 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 27 March 1990, at 5 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Democratic Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Colombia	Ms. CASTAÑO
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. SMIRNOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WILKINSON
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60341/A 7122V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 5 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

CENTRAL AMERICA: EFFORTS TOWARDS PEACE

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (S/21194)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, which is contained in document S/21194.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/21207, which contains the text of a draft resolution which has been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 650 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. WILKINSON (United States of America): A page of history is turning in Central America. The resolution we have just adopted makes clear that the challenge for us all is to accomplish the objectives set by the five Central American Presidents: a firm and lasting peace in Central America. Along with the Organization of American States and other observers, the United Nations played a key role in the free and fair elections which took place in Nicaragua in February. Now it can play a further essential part in democratization of this troubled region.

The United States supports both the full Esquipulas process of the five Central American Presidents and the continuing efforts by the Secretary-General and his staff, in consultation with the Council, to assist in implementation of the peace plan. We welcome the Secretary-General's report of 15 March, which proposes further steps to bring that plan to fruition.

We fully support the Secretary-General's intention to deploy phase IV of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) immediately. There is important work yet to be done in terms of achieving the cease-fire in El Salvador envisaged in the San Isidro Declaration and ensuring the cut-off of arms to irregular forces as stipulated by the five Presidents.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind about the position of the United States on the question of the contras: We want and encourage them to demobilize freely and return to their land to contribute to its development. This position has been amply stated both in public and in private by President Bush, Vice-President Quayle and Secretary of State Baker.

It must be clear in all our minds that after 10 years of struggle the Nicaraguan resistance has legitimate concerns for the safety of its members and their dependants.

We believe the framework of ONUCA's expanded mandate, proposed by the Secretary-General in his report, sets forth a useful starting-point for achieving

(Mr. Wilkinson, United States)

agreement by all the involved parties on a settlement leading to voluntary demobilization and repatriation of the resistance.

It is clear that this is only a framework into which many operational details must be fitted, especially in light of the 23 March demobilization agreement reached between the Nicaraguan resistance and representatives of Mrs. Chamorro's government-to-be. We applaud their agreement to arrange for prompt demobilization and call upon the Sandinista authorities in Managua to agree to the proposal immediately.

We believe it particularly important that the arrangements requested by the contras be set in place, namely

"an effective cease-fire by both sides, verifiable by international organizations"

and

"concentration of contra armed forces currently inside Nicaragua in security zones previously defined inside Nicaraguan territory and overseen by the above-mentioned international organizations and Cardinal Obando y Bravo, in order that the process of demobilization be carried out in an atmosphere of security and peace".

Clearly, the first priority must be achievement of formal agreement on and adherence to a cease-fire and a clear-cut separation of forces within Nicaragua.

The conditions for and the mechanisms to verify a comprehensive settlement are not yet in place. In addition to ONUCA, we also believe it essential that there be rapid movement to make the International Support and Verification Commission (CIAV) fully operational.

We believe it important, in this context, that the overall settlement plan be balanced and that responsibility for its successful implementation rest equally on

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Wilkinson, United States)

both the resistance and the current ruling party of Nicaragua, the Sandinista Front, and its military and security apparatus.

There has clearly been a new development in the peace process since the Secretary-General's report, with last Friday's agreement between the contras and the Opposition National Union (UNO), and we expect that this new development will be addressed in further proposals to the Council.

We will support and contribute to this process. We call upon all those who have influence with any of the parties in the region to contribute in a similar manner. The people of Nicaragua and of the entire Central American region will thank us for that contribution.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted on the understanding that the resolution can contribute to restoring peace in Nicaragua and that in the resolution the Council authorizes the Secretary-General to do what he asks us to authorize him to do: expanding the mandate of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) and the inclusion in that Group of armed personnel for the specific purpose of playing a role in the demobilization of the members of what is termed the Nicaraguan resistance.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

In so doing the Security Council is hoping to bring an end to something that, in our judgement, should not have existed. There is a long history of international efforts, especially those exerted by the States of Latin America, beginning with the formation of the Contadora Group at the beginning of the last decade, which, inter alia, appealed for the cessation of such actions against Nicaragua.

According to the latest information received from the Secretary-General, the present situation would indicate that there are still some areas of uncertainty as to how the process will unfold, areas that imply possible risks to the operation the United Nations is preparing to undertake, and we would alert members of the Council to them.

We hope that with the resolution just adopted and the activity of the United Nations in Nicaragua an end will finally be brought, once and for all, to the activities being carried out by those elements that have cost the people of Nicaragua so much in terms of human life and material damage.

During the consultations we have held some concerns have been expressed with regard to the financial implications of the United Nations operation on which, in the light of the latest developments in Nicaragua, some uncertainty may still remain. In that connection I would draw attention to the fact that it would be ironic if, at the end of this episode, it were to fall to the international community and to all Members of the Organization to pay for the mechanisms that will monitor the end of an operation that should never have taken place, particularly since the so-called Nicaraguan resistance has benefited from well-known external financing, which, if we rely only on the figures quoted for licit and public contributions from 1982 to date, amount to more than $321 million, some 40 times the amount the present operation will cost all the Members of the Organization. Indeed, in the United States fiscal year that has just elapsed, the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

amount was nearly $50 million - roughly five times the maximum amount the Secretary-General estimates it will cost all of us to be able, finally, to confirm the end of this lamentable page in Central American history.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2914
28 March 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 28 March 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Democratic Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mrs. KABA
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60353/A 7123V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 12 FEBRUARY 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21139)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber. I invite the representative of Palestine to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bendjama (Algeria), Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Menon (India), Mr. Sutresna (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq), Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Umer (Pakistan), Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar), Mr. Al-Kahtany (Saudi Arabia), Mrs. Diallo (Senegal), Mr. Awad (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Sallam (Yemen) and Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Al-Kidwa (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bangladesh, Morocco and the United Republic of Tanzania in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote,

(The President)

in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Rahhali (Morocco) and Mr. Nyakyi (United Republic of Tanzania) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The first speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): At the outset, I would like to express to you, Sir, the representative of friendly and non-aligned Democratic Yemen, the sincere congratulations of the Yugoslav delegation on the occasion of your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your vast diplomatic experience, which has been proven on many occasions of the various United Nations forums, gives us cause to believe that you will indeed discharge this responsible task successfully.

I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express my delegation's recognition of the Permanent Representative of Cuba, Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, for his very successful conduct of the Council's deliberations during the month of February.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

In my capacity as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and that Movement's Committee of Nine on Palestine, I wish to express the deep concern of the non-aligned countries regarding the announced intention of the Israeli Government to settle the Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union in the occupied territories. As a most serious issue, this is the subject of the present debate in the Security Council.

At a time of dramatic and rapid political changes in the world, marked by dialogue and relaxation, the continuing crisis situation in the Middle East, at the core of which is the unresolved question of Palestine, causes widespread concern and anxiety. The intifadah - the uprising of the Palestinian people - has demonstrated clearly and unequivocally the untenability of the situation created by foreign occupation.

Numerous attempts have been made by various factors, including the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in the past several months to start a productive Palestinian-Israeli dialogue as the first step towards the realization of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The Palestine Liberation Organization's constructive attitude and readiness to engage in dialogue aimed at finally bringing about lasting peace in that troubled region still lack an adequate response from the Israeli side. Demands putting unjustified pre-conditions on the opening of dialogue - pre-conditions that cannot be accepted - have raised a question in the mind of many non-aligned countries about the existence of the genuine readiness and political will on the part of some influential political circles in Israel to seek a comprehensive and lasting solution to this problem that would meet the aspirations of all countries and peoples in the region.

Certainly, the recent statements made by the highest-ranking officials of the Israeli Government implying that Israel will step up the settlement of the occupied

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

territories cannot be understood as a contribution to that end. It is therefore quite understandable that those statements have caused great anxiety and concern not only among the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and in neighbouring Arab States but also in the international community as a whole, particularly among non-aligned countries.

This Israel policy, it is generally agreed, further complicates the tense and complex situation in the region, which continues to be on the verge of a broad armed conflict, with potentially catastrophic consequences. For that reason, this situation was at the centre of the attention of the Ministerial Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement's Committee of Nine held on 11 March in Tunis.

Expressing their deep concern over the serious situation in the Middle East, the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries warned on that occasion that

> "The declared policy of Israel to settle Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, was of grave consequence. Such organized, mass actions undermined the peace process, jeopardizing all efforts undertaken so far, and they were in flagrant violation of the norms of law, the Fourth Geneva Convention and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and of the fundamental human rights of the Palestinian people." (S/21192, para. 6)

The final communiqué goes on to say that

> "Supporting the right of every individual to leave any country, including his own, the Ministers stressed that the exercise of this right should not be imposed or to the detriment of others, in this particular case of the Palestinians. The non-aligned countries called upon the international community and the United Nations Security Council to take resolute action to prevent such attempts and declare them illegal, null and void. In this context they called upon the Security Council to consider measures for the

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

impartial protection of the Palestinian civilian population under Israeli occupation and to call upon all States not to provide Israel with any assistance to be used specifically in connection with settlements in the occupied territories." (ibid.)

Non-aligned countries therefore rightly expect that, as in the past, the Security Council will take a firm position with respect to the inadmissibility of the Israeli policy on the settlements in the occupied territories, a policy that is contrary to the norms of international law and constitutes a most serious additional element of tension and instability not only in the occupied Palestinian territories but also in the broader Middle East region.

Such action by the Security Council is needed also to facilitate the efforts designed to open the peace process aimed at a lasting, just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East crisis and the question of Palestine.

This latest deterioration in the situation in the occupied territories is yet another warning of all the dangers inherent in the existing state of "no war, no peace" and its destabilizing effects on the security of the broader area. In that sense, the Middle East region has come to a crossroads. As stated by the Foreign Ministers of the nine non-aligned countries members of the Committee on Palestine at their meeting in Tunis,

"the Middle East process has entered an important and critical stage in creating conditions for the establishment of fruitful Palestinian-Israeli dialogue, which should focus on all the substantive issues." (ibid., para. 11)

The non-aligned countries are of the opinion that a lasting and just solution to the Middle East crisis and the question of Palestine is possible only with the participation, on a footing of equality, of the Palestinian people, under the

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization as its only legitimate representative, in all negotiations and phases of the peace process, which should constitute an integral part of the International Peace Conference.

The non-aligned countries earnestly hope that these meetings of the Security Council will make a contribution towards the attainment of that goal. It is high time for the Security Council to get actively involved in the efforts to find a peaceful and just solution to the Middle East crisis and the problem of Palestine. The non-aligned countries still believe that the most suitable framework to serve this goal is the early convening of the International Conference on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Each and every delay is fraught with new dangers, with potentially serious consequences.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Yugoslavia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. UMER (Pakistan): Allow me to begin, Sir, by conveying to you the sincere felicitations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are confident that your vast experience and skills will ensure the smooth functioning of the work of the Council.

I should also like to express our deepest appreciation to Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon, the Permanent Representative of Cuba, for the outstanding manner in which he managed the affairs of the Security Council in the month of February.

The current debate is indeed another reminder of Israel's intransigence and deliberate policy of thwarting every peace initiative. The reason for this attitude is simple. Israel persists in the mistaken belief that it can, in due

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

course of time, transform into a fait accompli its gradual absorption of the Palestine and Arab territories which, through massive use of force, it continues to occupy illegally. We condemn, once again, this policy of expansion and annexation.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

What the international community has witnessed over the past two years is essentially a sharpening contrast between Palestinian moderation and Israeli obduracy. On the Palestinian side is the peace initiative launched by Chairman Yasser Arafat in 1988. The political resolution adopted by the Palestine National Council confirmed the determination of the Palestine Liberation Organization to reach a comprehensive peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its crux, the Palestinian question. The initiative envisages the solution of the problem within the framework of the United Nations Charter, the rules of international law and the resolutions of the United Nations in a manner that will secure the right of the Palestinian Arab people to establish an independent State on their national territory as well as to ensure conditions of security and peace for all the States of the region.

Unfortunately, Palestinian moderation has been met with increasing Israeli intransigence and resort to violence. Israel has so far shown nothing but complete disregard for the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. The heroic intifadah of the Palestinians is being brutally suppressed, and all initiatives aimed at finding a lasting and just solution to the problem have been rejected by Israel. The policy of large-scale settlement of foreign Jews in occupied territories needs to be seen in the context of Israel's long-standing policy of intransigence, rejection and forceful occupation.

The settlement of Jewish immigrants into Palestine is not a new development. In fact, it formed the very basis of the Zionist ideology of the ingathering of the exiles, under which Jews from all countries of the world should form a Jewish national home in Palestine. Later, Zionism aimed at a general political strategy. The head of the World Zionist Organization's settlement department declared that "Our settlements have always established the facts of the map of Israel".

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

Professor Moshe Arens was more specific when he said that the struggle over settlements was an organic part of the struggle over the peace borders.

Immediately after the 1948 hostilities the Jewish population illegally seized land and property belonging to the Palestinians, and the Israeli Government sanctioned those de facto acquisitions on grounds of security and defence. This was followed by a policy of systematic deportation of the rightful inhabitants of Palestine. Settlement and land expropriation became the dominant Israeli policy, and the result, as we all know, was the virtual displacement of the Arab nation of Palestine, except as a discriminated-against and persecuted remnant in Israel.

The same policy was followed in respect of the occupied territories after 1967. Even the friends of Israel have deplored that policy. The report of the United States Department of State on human rights practices for 1989 states that

> "Israel continued to place land under its control for military purposes, roads, settlements and other purposes which restrict use by Palestinians and discriminate in favour of Israeli settlers against Palestinians".

A report prepared recently by the West Bank Data Project also concludes that the Government of Israel offers special incentives to Israeli citizens, including new immigrants, to move to the settlements. It is estimated that more than 140 Jewish settlements have been established in the West Bank and Gaza and that more than 60 per cent of the land in the territories has been seized by the Israeli authorities since the end of the military operations in 1967. Moreover, about 120,000 Israelis are said to have settled in the new neighbourhoods in East Jerusalem built after 1967.

According to the latest estimates, nearly 1 million foreign Jews could ultimately be settled in Palestine over the next 10 years. Since most of the emigrants are reportedly leaving not for religious reasons but to seek better economic conditions, their first-choice destinations were the countries of the

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

West. However, due to stringent immigration laws, the flow of emigrants is being redirected towards Israel. This has created a patently unjust and incongruous situation in which the people of Palestine cannot enjoy a sovereign national life in the place of their birth and continuous residence, while foreign Jews are allowed to displace them.

At a meeting of the Likud Party on 14 January 1990, the then Prime Minister of Israel was reported to have stated that

"Big emigration requires Israel to be big as well. We need the space to house all the people".

Despite later denials and an effort to censor news reports on migration, it is obvious that this policy is still continuing. The Washington Post of 27 January reported the mayor of Ariel, a Jewish settlement in the occupied territory, as saying:

"If we get half a million Jews from the Soviet Union all the reasons for compromising and trading land for peace will disappear".

According to the Washington Post there are already 70,000 Jewish settlers in the occupied territories, and their leaders have repeatedly voiced their determination to attract thousands of Soviet emigrants, even without special Government allocations.

The Israeli leadership obviously hopes that as in the past the policy of creating facts will perpetuate its annexation of the occupied Arab territories by creating a fait accompli of a Greater Israel at the expense of the rights of the Palestinian people. Undoubtedly it also believes that such massive large-scale immigration will thwart the Palestinian intifadah by creating a conflict between the Palestinian people and the new Jewish settlers.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

The Israeli plans for settlement in the occupied territories are contrary to the Hague Convention on the Laws and Customs of War on Land of 1907 and article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949, which clearly stipulates that the occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own population into the territory it occupies. Such settlements are also in direct violation of the resolutions of the United Nations, including in particular Security Council resolutions 446 (1979), 465 (1980) and 478 (1980), which expressly forbade Israel as the occupying Power from changing the demographic character of the occupied territories, including Jerusalem.

It is our earnest hope that the Council will send a clear and forthright message to the Israeli authorities to stop forthwith this massive breach of international law and this unacceptable violation of the rights of the Palestinian people. The urgency of the situation is underscored also by the fact that continuation of the policy of settling Jews in the occupied territory will seriously undermine the prospects for peace in the region.

The last decade closed on a ringing note of triumph for freedom and human dignity. It is indeed ironic that the march of freedom should have stopped at the frontiers of Palestine, a land whose brave and valiant people have struggled so much for so long in their quest for the inalienable right to self-determination and statehood. It is incumbent upon the international community, in particular the Security Council, to intensify its efforts to ensure that this right, so universally cherished, is no longer denied the people of Palestine. It is equally imperative that any attempt to raise obstacles that undermine the prospects of a lasting, just and comprehensive settlement, such as the one which has necessitated this debate, be resolutely opposed and rejected.

(Mr. Umer, Pakistan)

The framework for peace in the Middle East, fully supported by the General Assembly, already exists in the proposed convening of an international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, to be attended by the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization on an equal footing. The urgency of the situation requires the initiation of tangible measures for the convening of that conference.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Pakistan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MENON (India): May I begin by extending to you, Sir, our felicitations on your presidency of the Security Council for the current month. India and Democratic Yemen have enjoyed long-established links of friendship and co-operation, which underlines our pleasure at seeing you chair this important meeting.

I should like to take this opportunity to compliment your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba, for his leadership of the Council during the preceding month.

Since this is the first time that my delegation is addressing the Council this year, I should like to felicitate its new members - Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Romania and Zaire - on their election to it. Our tribute goes also to the members who retired last year - Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia - for their contributions to the Council's work.

The implications - undeniably adverse - of Israel's settlement of new Jewish immigrants in the Arab territories occupied by it bring the Council together in its traditional role of addressing concerns relating to peace and security. Since

(Mr. Menon, India)

1967, when Israel occupied East Jerusalem, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and other Arab territories, it has been encouraging and promoting settlements in those occupied territories not only of its own population but also of new Jewish immigrants. The policy has been deliberate and systematic, in defiance of United Nations resolutions, international law and world public opinion.

To go back a little in history: The United Nations General Assembly, in resolution 32/5 of 1977, stated that the measures and actions taken by the Government of Israel, as the occupying Power, in the occupied Arab territories had no legal validity and constituted a serious obstruction to efforts aimed at achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The General Assembly strongly deplored the persistence of Israeli measures in this regard, in particular the establishment of settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

Later, in 1979, a Commission set up by the Security Council to examine the situation relating to such settlements came to the conclusion that Israel's policy had "largely contributed to a deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories" and that it was "incompatible with the pursuit of peace in the area" (S/13679, para. 45). The Commission recommended that:

> "the Security Council adopt effective measures to prevail on Israel to cease the establishment of settlements in occupied territories and to dismantle the existing settlements accordingly". (Ibid., para. 54)

The Commission's conclusions and recommendations were accepted by the Council in resolution 465 (1980) of 1 March 1980. Attention was thus drawn to the grave consequences of Israel's settlements policy and its lack of legal validity. Furthermore, in various United Nations resolutions the policy was considered a flagrant violation of the fourth Geneva Convention, a point that deserves to be stressed in our consideration of this issue.

(Mr. Menon, India)

Israel has, however, not been deterred. It has continued its expansionist settlements policy, along with the displacement of the indigenous Arab population from their homeland. When the Palestinian people rose in revolt in their intifadah, which continues today and whose daily heroisms have been well documented, the occupying Power resorted to severe reprisals, including deportations, illegal detentions, torture, demolition of houses, imposition of military and economic blockades and use of excessive force leading to casualties.

Recently Israel announced that, to accommodate the increasing influx of new Jewish immigrants, particularly those coming from the Soviet Union, it needed a "Greater Israel". What this amounted to was Israel's pursuit of the eventual objective of annexing all occupied territories.

The security of one State cannot be at the expense of the security of other States, nor can it be based on depriving a people of their security, their homes and their homeland. Further settlement of non-Palestinian people in the occupied territories only compounds the existing illegality of Israeli occupation of those territories by force. At a time when all interested parties are seeking to promote the peace process in the region, such activities can only jeopardize efforts to bring the parties concerned to the negotiating table.

We face, therefore, on the one hand, an Israeli policy that complicates and undermines processes meant to promote peace while, on the other, there is widening acknowledgement of the importance of the peace initiatives put forward by the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. This acknowledgement and appreciation were evident in the great support the relevant resolution obtained at last year's session of the United Nations General Assembly. However, a section of the Israeli leadership insists on turning away from the reality that a solution in the West Asian region can be found

(Mr. Menon, India)

only in a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement that addresses the core issue of Palestine and takes fully into cognizance the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and their own homeland, as well as the recognition of the rights of all States in the region to live in peace within internationally recognized and secure boundaries. Instead of promoting the peace process on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), Israel opens out the prospect of a larger influx of Soviet Jewish immigrants, ranging from 750,000 to one million in the 1990s. Such a prospect bodes ill for progress in peacemaking for the region.

India has consistently upheld the cause of the Palestinian people and their struggle as part of the wider global movement against colonial rule, oppression and injustice. Addressing the Non-Aligned Committee of Nine on Palestine at its ministerial meeting at Tunis on 11 March this year, our Minister for External Affairs, Mr. I. K. Gujral, expressed concern at Israel's intention to settle a large number of Soviet Jews in the occupied territories. He said:

> "The development has grave implications and calls for speedy and united action by the international community. Israel is in illegal occupation of these territories, and there are numerous resolutions calling upon it to withdraw from these territories. Encouragement of further settlement of non-Palestinian people in the occupied territories amounts to the compounding of the existing illegality of the occupation of these territories by Israel by force."

(Mr. Menon, India)

At a time when all the interested parties are painstakingly looking for an acceptable approach for starting the peace process, this development cannot but have the effect of further complicating the process of bringing together the parties to the negotiating table. This is also likely to increase the already existing tension in the occupied territories and may even result in greater violence and conflicts. Finally, this development has the effect of destabilizing security and imperilling peace in the entire region. We are aware of the human rights angle of this issue. However, the rights of one section of the human population cannot be exercised at the cost of the rights of others. While talking of human rights we have to be mindful of the human rights of the Palestinians in the occupied territories who have been suffering for decades."

In this context, Mr. Gujral called for the Non-Aligned Movement as a whole to exercise its influence to prevent this ominous development and to address itself, as it has been doing, to the wider question of the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

The Non-Aligned Movement's Committee of Nine on Palestine, of which India is a member, echoed these concerns in its communiqué issued after its ministerial meeting in Tunis on 11 March this year. It called upon the international community and the Security Council to take resolute action to prevent such Israeli attempts and declare them illegal, null and void. The Ministers supported the right of every individual to leave any country, including his own, but stressed at the same time that the exercise of that right should not be imposed on, or be to the detriment of, others - in this particular case, of the Palestinians. They called upon the Security Council to consider measures for the impartial protection of the Palestinian civilian population under Israeli occupation, and urged all States not

(Mr. Menon, India)

to provide Israel with any assistance to be used specifically in connection with settlements in the occupied territories.

Our Prime Minister, Mr. V. P. Singh, in a recent message to the Palestinian President, Mr. Yasser Arafat, reiterated India's principled support for the Palestinian cause, and agreed that pressure should be brought to bear upon Israel against its policy of resettling Soviet Jews in the occupied Palestine and Arab areas. As I said earlier, my country believes that this policy of Israel militates against the current peace moves, as well as the principal objective, as formulated in various General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, to be convened urgently under United Nations auspices, with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, on an equal footing. The end objective is, of course, the restoration of the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

In an era characterized by a relaxation of tensions in relations between nations - in particular, between the super-Powers - actions such as Israel's can only be considered inflammatory and a threat to peace. My delegation believes that measures are urgently needed to defuse the risks to which the peace process is being subjected by these Israeli actions. In the general context of today's world political situation, where compromise and reconciliation have recorded notable gains, it is incongruous that no perceptible progress has been made in resolving the Palestinian issue. Countries best placed to influence the course of events in Palestine are not showing the determination to resolve this issue that they have displayed on some other issues.

If the Palestinian problem is allowed to fester, it can have adverse effects on the general climate of relaxation of tensions. It therefore becomes necessary

(Mr. Menon, India)

for the international community, as represented within and outside this Chamber, to address itself to the issue at hand.

The tragedy of Palestine should not be compounded by the unilateral policies of the occupying Power. Nor should the international community underestimate its responsibility of challenging such policies and seeking to get them changed. The larger cause of peace in Palestine and in the region as a whole and the restoration of Palestinian rights that underpins it demand our continued support and solidarity. We trust that the Council will address the issue in full awareness of the need to promote and bring to fruition the just cause of the Palestinian people.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Security Council this year permit me first, Sir, warmly to congratulate the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Romania and Zaire, as well as you yourself, as the representative of Democratic Yemen, upon their countries' being elected non-permanent members of the Council. I also pay tribute to their predecessors in the Council, the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia, who by their tireless efforts in this important organ of the United Nations made such an important contribution to the cause of strengthening international peace and security.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In welcoming you, Sir, to the important post of President of the Council for this month, I wish to express my certainty that your great professional merits and authority, as well as your personal qualities, as representative of the friendly country you have represented so worthily for so many years at the United Nations will enable you to discharge your arduous duties in March in the best possible way. I also wish to express my gratitude to your predecessor as President, the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations, Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, for his skilful conduct of the Council's proceedings last month.

The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic shares the concern expressed in the letter dated 12 February 1990 from the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requesting that the Security Council be convened to consider unlawful Israeli moves to settle the occupied territories. Only a short time has passed since in the General Assembly's discussion of the situation in the Middle East at its forty-fourth session there was clearly expressed the idea that in present circumstances, in the light of the gravity of the Palestinian problem, it was extremely important to harvest the fruits of the great and hard-won efforts to achieve a Middle East settlement, and that following the path to such a settlement required patience and wisdom.

Indeed, developments in the area have aroused entirely well-founded hopes in the international community of a genuine breakthrough towards bringing about a settlement of the long-standing Arab-Israel conflict and its core, the Palestinian question. Now more than ever we need realistic and judicious actions by all the parties to the conflict.

In that regard, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to state its concern about the propaganda campaign being waged in certain circles around the growing emigration of Jewish persons from the Soviet Union, and in particular the

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, to Israel. I stress that the problem directly affects the interests of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

In 1989 a total of 45,710 Jewish citizens of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic received permission to leave the country. Of that total, only 16 per cent went to live permanently in Israel, and only 0.01 per cent, it is estimated, actually settled in the occupied territories.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The subject of Jewish emigration has recently been the target of an attempt by ruling circles in Israel to exploit it for its unsavoury purposes.

While there are concerted efforts in the international community to bring about a peaceful, just and comprehensive solution to the Palestinian problem guaranteeing the Palestinian people the exercise of its lawful rights and opening up for the peoples of the area the path to peace and security, Israel is making statements that confirm its aggressive ambitions, its expansionist plans and its intention to sabotage the peace negotiations designed to call a halt to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Mr. Shamir's statement that "the Lord has always come to the aid of the Jewish people at its most difficult moments" - it is precisely from this standpoint that he views the prospect of the settlement in the next five years of up to 500,000 Jews in Israel, which, as he sees it, will help the dream of a "Greater Israel" to come true - has had the effect of an exploding bomb in the Arab world. They have quite rightly seen in this a direct connection between these words and the continuing settlement of new immigrants on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, which are in the throes of an uprising.

We think that the carrying out of such plans aimed at the de facto annexation of Palestinian lands, not to mention that it is in direct violation of the universally acknowledged norms of international law - and in this case with the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 - would deal a blow to the prospects of a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and a just solution to the Palestinian problem and open up a new chapter in the grim history of confrontation in the Middle East.

In our view, such statements by the Israeli leadership are aimed at a number of things: to exploit the incoming immigrants for the forcible expulsion of Palestinians from the land that belongs to them; to hinder the process of

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

international co-operation in the search for the most acceptable ways and means of solving the Middle East conflict on a just basis in the light of the interests of both Israelis and Arabs and, above all, the Palestinian people; and to halt, and if this is successful, even to reverse the tendency towards a change in public opinion inside and outside Israel in favour of peace negotiations with the Palestinians and of the creation, alongside Israel, of a Palestinian State.

As to the concern on the question of the growth of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, I should like to make one thing absolutely clear: the problem lies not in emigration as such. The laws prevailing here are the same for all. There can be no special status for anyone, in this case for persons of Jewish nationality, with regard to the right to leave the country. To undertake prohibitions would mean violating international obligations and dealing a blow to the democratic process within our country.

The essence of the problem lies in the fact that some Israeli leaders still entertain hopes that the world will at some time come to agree that they have the right to lord it over the lands of others. In this regard I should like to draw the Council's attention to the main point: the settling of Palestinian territories, regardless of whether it is by compulsion or voluntary, is unlawful and any attempts to change the demographic character of these territories by the occupying power is illegal - and this is something the Ukrainian SSR has frequently stated in the United Nations. The West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip have never belonged and do not belong to the state of Israel. It is worth recalling here Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which is the universally acknowdged basis for a Middle East settlement, and also resolution 465 (1980), calling upon Israel to halt the practice of settling the West Bank and Gaza.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

I should like to stress once again that Soviet citizens have the right to emigrate to any country, and this is entirely in keeping with the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Vienna Agreements. But we vigorously protest against their being settled in the lands of others. This is a violation of the norms of international law and is morally wrong from the standpoint of respect for basic human rights - and we have no doubt about the fact that these people are precisely being encouraged to settle.

Of course, there is no forced settlement. But everyone knows that in the occupied territories new immigrants are offered free housing, that is, housing subsidized by the State. For example, in Tel Aviv and other parts of the country immigrants have to pay for housing themselves, and this makes a great difference to people who have no money and no work and who have to begin life over again from scratch. So this is an official policy, an economic incentive for settlement in the occupied territories.

Now, is there any possibility of avoiding a situation where as a result of emigration from the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and other countries we can prevent the spiral of conflict from becoming even more intensive? Yes, there is, but on condition that all interested parties set to work without emotion in an attempt to bring about a sensible compromise. But Israel must give clear guarantees not to settle incoming immigrants in the occupied territories.

We trust that the Israeli Government will heed, finally, the view of the international community which will not accept its policy in the occupied Arab territories. This position was confirmed in General Assembly resolution 44/42, which was adopted by a record number of votes.

The Ukrainian SSR delegation welcomes the evolution in the approach of the United States Administration to this question, an approach which increases the possibility of concerted action on the part of the international community in order

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

to promote a peace process in the Middle East and prevent the creation of additional obstacles to it.

The Ukrainian SSR delegation wishes to take this opportunity to repeat our appeal to the Government of Israel to draw the necessary conclusions from the discussion here in the Security Council and associate itself with the international consensus in favour of implementing the idea of convening an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations and with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council and all parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing. In our view, such a conference would be the best possible forum for finding mutually acceptable solutions on all aspects of the Middle East conflict - and this includes the question we are considering today.

We should like to express the hope that the Security Council will take a decision which will halt Israel's actions aimed at changing the demographic structure of the occupied territories.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Qatar. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month, which we welcome in view of your well-known wisdom. We also wish to express our best wishes to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Cuba, who presided over the work of the Council very competently.

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

I thank you, Sir, for having given me this opportunity to participate in the debate of the Council on behalf of Qatar. I should like to emphasize the importance my Government - like all Arab and other Governments that cherish peace and justice - attaches to the subject before the Council.

The wave of Soviet Jewish settlers in the Arab territories occupied since 1967 is an extremely grave situation which the international community must prevent firmly and with determination. The dangers of such immigration and the settlement of those immigrants, if given free rein, are a threat to international peace and security. That is true on three counts.

First, the acts of the occupier in the occupied territories violate international law and the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949. That Convention clearly forbids occupying Powers to alter the demographic composition of occupied territories by expelling the indigenous population or by bringing in foreign elements and settling them in those territories. The Council has repeatedly reaffirmed the applicability of the Geneva Conventions to the occupied territories. It has also affirmed that Israel, by virtue of law, must respect the provisions of those Conventions. My delegation would therefore ask that this be reaffirmed and that measures be taken guaranteeing the implementation of those Conventions, so that they not remain dead letter.

Secondly, if the current practices go unpunished, they will have unfavourable repercussions on efforts being made to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by peaceful means. Those efforts are progressing at a snail's pace, for reasons familiar to all, but at least steps are being taken. All peace-loving countries hope that this long-standing conflict will be resolved on the basis of law and justice. But if those waves of immigrants continue to arrive in the occupied

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

territories, then the peace process will breathe its last breath and all attempts to resolve the conflict through negotiations will be undermined.

Thirdly, the establishment of Soviet Jews in the occupied territories jeopardizes the ongoing peace process. Thus, if tens of thousands of foreigners settle there, negotiations between the Palestinians and Israelis will not be able to continue, since they will have been stripped of all foundation. An attempt is being made to find a peaceful solution allowing the two parties to enter into dialogue. If remaining Palestinian lands are turned into Jewish settlements, it would undermine the very objective of those negotiations and doom them from the outset. They would be left devoid of a raison d'être.

The item before the Council today requires firm, practical measures, not just resolutions stipulating certain principles that in practice would remain dead letter. Therefore, it would be futile for the countries concerned to impose conditions such as the non-settlement of new immigrants in the occupied territories or the granting of foreign assistance for that purpose. Such theoretical conditions, in financial and human terms, would not prevent the implementation of the Israeli plan, which is aimed at changing the demographic composition of the occupied territories. Unless an end is truly put to the flow of immigrants and the assistance halted, and if Israel is not convinced that an end must be put to these waves of immigrants and if aid to them is not halted, then Israel will pursue its plan, which is to settle Soviet Jews in the occupied territories in order to change the demographic composition of those lands. We hope that the Council will adopt a resolution that encompasses those principles in a way that does not merely condemn the settlement of new immigrants in the occupied territories. The States concerned should be encouraged to take concrete measures to ensure the true implementation of the Council's resolutions.

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

The settlement of Soviet Jews in occupied Palestinian lands is only one aspect of the Middle East problem, at the heart of which lies the Palestinian question. We need not look far for the real causes of the situation in the Middle East. Ever since Israel has been in the region, ever since it expelled the population from its lands and from its homes, ever since it usurped the goods and property of the population, the people of the region have been condemned to the living hell of conflict in an attempt to recover its expropriated lands.

In addition to the occupation of Gaza and the West Bank, Israel is consolidating its aggression and is perpetrating new acts of aggression, such as the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights and of Lebanese territory through a number of invasions. In 1982, Israeli forces went as far as Beirut, the capital of Lebanon. They perpetrated their daily acts of aggression by air, land and sea. Israel also undertook aggression against Tunisia and struck at a peaceful nuclear reactor in Iraq.

Those are but a few examples of Israeli practices in the Middle East. To that we would add the ideology of expansion, which is the prevailing ideology that threatens all neighbouring States with the risk of being attacked. International will, as represented by our international Organization and its resolutions, has agreed that a peace conference on the Middle East should be held under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The framework of international legality for the peaceful settlement of the conflict consists of Israel's withdrawal from all occupied territories, recognition of the right of Palestine to self-determination, and the establishment of its own independent State.

The time has come for the international community to take a position consistent with the noble principles of our international Organization, especially

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

the right of peoples to freedom and self-determination. That fundamental principle of international law must be applied to the Palestinian people.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Qatar for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to give his statement.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I am proud to see you assuming that post, not only as the representative of a friendly country that shares past, present and future ties with my country as well as a common destiny, but also as a representative of the Arab nation. Yemen was a cradle of civilization; it is a source of advancement and the hope of the future.

I should also like to express my full appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, the representative of friendly Cuba, who led the Council constructively and positively last month.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The Security Council is meeting once again to discuss one of the most important issues of our times: the question of the Palestinian people - indeed, I would venture to say, the tragedy of the Palestinian people. The Council is meeting to discuss one aspect of that tragedy and the phenomenon of Zionist expansionist settlement: the mass, systematic immigration to Palestine and the occupied Arab territories.

The mass, systematic Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and other places to Palestine is only a new link in the chain of the Palestinian tragedy. It is only a new phase of the Zionist scheme to occupy all of Palestine as well as many parts of the Arab nation, in order to establish the Greater Zionist State from the Nile to the Euphrates.

The phenomenon of Zionist settlement in Palestine and this increasing, systematic immigration is a colonial phenomenon in the full meaning of the word. The aim is the complete elimination, the liquidation of the Palestinian people and, in the meantime, the displacement of those who are still there.

The late President Nasser said, "He who did not own gave to him who did not deserve". Through the Balfour Declaration, of such ill omen, Britain - which was colonizing Palestine then - gave Palestine to the world Zionists. At the same time, it gave South Africa to the white minority, in order to establish a racist State there. The two systems are identical in their composition and their expansionist, aggressive policies, and in the policies of terrorism and mass annihilation pursued by both.

It is astonishing to see this mass immigration taking place under the slogan of human rights. We emphasize the freedom of the human being, his freedom of movement; but, in my opinion, this freedom is indivisible. Why should the Palestinian human being not have the right to return to his homeland? What logic is there in talking about human rights and, at the same time, accepting the right

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

to persecute people? What kind of human right is that? Why should one human being be differentiated from another human being merely because of religion or colour? Why should not those who profess Christianity or Islam have the same rights as those who profess Judaism?

When some Soviet Christians travelled to Israel a few weeks ago and were refused entry by the Israelis, no one talked about that. What about human rights in that case? When thousands of Palestinians are expelled from their land, and their houses and farms are demolished, that appears to be of concern to no one.

We all witnessed that great publicity campaign against the Soviet Union - a campaign waged particularly by the United States of America, which used all kinds of political and economic pressure and linked international détente to the immigration of Soviet Jews. When the Soviet Union agreed to that, the United States determined the proportion of Soviet Jews that would emigrate to the United States - in order to direct them to occupied Palestine for settlement in the occupied Arab territories.

We welcome international détente and the promotion of freedom in the world, as well as the emphasis on human rights. But we support human rights for everyone - not for some special people alone, on the pretext that God promised them a certain land. We do not deem it appropriate to think of God as a trader in slaves or in land.

We condemn discrimination in southern Africa on the basis of colour, why do we not condemn discrimination in Palestine on the basis of religion? What would be the reaction if, for example, the United States or the Soviet Union or France or Great Britain declared that it was a Christian State and, therefore, forbade the immigration of non-Christians and expelled people of other faiths, including Jews and Moslems? What would happen if some countries with Moslem or Hindu or Buddhist majorities declared that they were States based on religion and therefore forbade other faiths and religions?

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

This mass immigration is completely different from the immigration of individual human beings, which is recognized by international norms. International law and human rights do not allow for the expulsion of one people and its replacement by another people, on the pretext that God promised the latter people that it could live in a certain land.

What has happened to the Palestinian people could happen to any other people. It could have happened in Argentina or Uganda or the eastern part of Libya. If the eastern part of Libya had been occupied, in accordance with the design at the beginning of the century, in order to become the land of the Zionists, I who am sitting here today could have been a refugee, just like the Palestinian refugees.

Even those who recognize the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate to the Palestinian territories that have been occupied since 1948 fly in the face of reality and contradict themselves. How can this piece of land absorb these millions? Or perhaps the intention is to apply the policy of lebensraum applied by nazism in the days of Hitler. The State of the Zionist entity is the only State in the world that has no map. The leaders of that State have called very clearly for the establishment of Greater Israel, through the annexation of land by force - Jerusalem, the Golan Heights, southern Lebanon. And, if we do not take the necessary measures, this will be followed by the annexation of other lands from neighbouring Arab countries.

The establishment of settlements in the occupied territories not only threatens the people of Palestine and eliminates any hopes for peace, but also jeopardizes Arab security as a whole and undermines any kind of peace based on justice.

The Security Council has the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and, therefore, it must take every measure to

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

prevent the establishment of these settlements. The Council has adopted binding resolutions calling for a boycott of South Africa. As Africans, we were happy about those resolutions, which made a positive contribution to the independence of Namibia, which we celebrated a few days ago. I congratulate the people of Namibia on this historic victory, which has marked the beginning of the end of the imperialist apartheid system. But the Council seems to be unable today to take any measure to stop the policy of mass murder and annexation, the policy of aggression and expansionism engaged in by the Israelis.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Even the criticisms by countries with a great responsibility in this matter are interpreted in such a way as not to offend the Israelis. The Israeli entity would never have been able to establish settlements without the billions of dollars handed to it. It could not have flouted the resolutions of the United Nations, including those of the Council, or the Geneva Conventions and other international agreements were it not for the material and moral support and military and political protection provided by certain great Powers which bear special responsibility under the Charter.

There is an outcry when a single Arab country acquires even limited means of self-defence. But nothing is said when the Israelis possess nuclear weapons and long-range missiles and when they refuse to sign any agreement on nuclear or chemical disarmament. Israel does indeed possess nuclear and chemical weapons; it uses poison gas against Palestinian women. That, they tell us, is "legitimate, civilized and humane" and is applauded by the mass media. But the Arabs are "terrorists": How dare they call for a return to their land? How dare they resist occupation? The Palestinians should say yes to occupation. They should say yes to murder and annihilation. What can we call that attitude? We can only call it racism against the Arab nation.

How can we give credence to those who talk of human rights when only a few days ago in their legislature they adopted a resolution establishing the right to acquire land by force and bolstering the principle of occupation and settlement and of the annexation of Jerusalem, despite all resolutions to the contrary? What is the nature of the human rights that are spoken of in the same breath as talk of annihilating one people and replacing it by another?

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

We want to emphasize the right of the individual to emigration. That right should be opened up so that every Soviet emigrant has a free choice of destination. Why should there not be an equal right of emigration for all?

The establishment of any State on the basis of colour, religion, beliefs or philosophy is a grave matter and is unacceptable today, at the end of the twentieth century.

We welcome the policy of international détente between the two super-Powers when it is aimed at achieving peace, democracy and freedom, but we reject it when it is pursued at the expense of the smaller peoples and is aimed at replacing one people by another and at creating further human tragedy.

We are faced by a new choice; we must confront the question of the credibility of the Security Council. Will it shoulder its responsibilities or will interests, calculations and election campaigns dictate its policy? The Palestinians have offered everything: they have nothing left to offer in exchange for peace. But the Zionists reject every call for peace; they establish more and more settlements and threaten to expel the remaining Palestinians. They challenge the international community and flout its resolutions.

The Council should take practical measures to ensure the Palestinian people's return to its land and its enjoyment of the right of self-determination exercised by other peoples. It should also put a stop to the systematic emigration that threatens the entire area.

We call upon the Soviet Union to take practical measures to stop the mass emigration to Palestine and other occupied Arab territories. We call upon the United States of America to stop providing funds and other assistance that could be used for the establishment of settlements and the displacement of the Palestinian

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

people. We appeal to all States that provide assistance of any kind to the Zionist entity to halt that assistance, because it contributes to the displacement of the Palestinians.

While we lay unequivocal stress on the unrestricted right of individuals to move anywhere they want. We bear no animosity towards our cousins, the Jewish people. We respect Judaism as a religion. For many centuries, when Jews were persecuted in Europe, we protected them. We opened our land and our hearts to them because they are our cousins: we are all Semites. But we reject Zionism as a racist, colonialist, settler movement, and we consider that it represents a danger to both Arabs and Jews. Arabs and Jews are cousins, belonging to the same race. They must stand together to eliminate the threat of Zionism, which is a threat to the entire world.

Despite our bitter experience and despite the Security Council's inability in the past to adopt any effective resolutions on this subject, we hope - in the light of the great developments in the world and the international campaign in favour of human rights - that the conscience of the international community will be aroused and that legitimate rights will be restored to those who are entitled to them. We hope that Palestinian and Arab human beings will be treated like any other human beings. We hope that a just peace will be established. We are the nation of Islam, the nation of peace.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Bahrain. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AL-SHAKAR (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset, Sir, I should like to congratulate you most warmly and sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. The election of your fraternal country to membership of the Security Council was eloquent testimony to the prestige and esteem enjoyed by the Democratic Republic of Yemen and to its constant outstanding role in strengthening international understanding and in laying the foundations for co-operation among nations as an embodiment of the lofty ideals nd principles of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

I am fully confident that your well-known wisdom and capabilities and your wide experience and profound loyalty to the Organization's work will stand you in good stead in guiding the work of the Council and in achieving positive results during its work this month.

I also take this opportunity to extend thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, the Permanent Representative of Cuba, for his efforts in guiding the Council's work last month so faithfully and competently.

The Security Council is meeting in the midst of the major international transformations that are ushering in the last decade of this century. The successive events in the international arena that have occurred in Eastern Europe have led to a calm in the ideological cold war that had governed relations between the two rival blocs, bringing the super-Powers from détente to a true relaxation of tension and, finally, to what seems to be accord.

Israel has hastened to exploit the new international situation created by the changes in international relations. On the pretext of everyone's human rights and freedom to travel and emigrate, Israel called for the door of emigration for Soviet and East European Jews to be opened so that it might achieve its dream of controlling more Arab territories, annexing and depopulating them to accommodate new hordes of Jewish immigrants from all over the world. That has led to an increasing flow of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to the occupied Palestinian territories and to the settlement there of thousands of Jews in an act of aggression against the rights of the Palestinian people to their land and to their country.

Given that situation, we feel it is incumbent upon the Security Council to address the question of Jewish emigration from the political perspective, which

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

raises a valid question that can be neither dismissed nor ignored. In that perspective, the Israeli scheme to exploit the emigration to support its policy of annexation and expansion so that it can hold onto the occupied Arab territories and empty them of their Palestinian-Arab population becomes clear. Among other sinister results, the deluge of the systematic Jewish immigration is impeding the peace process and flouting the right of the Palestinian people to regain their territory and to exercise their national rights therein. Hence it is clear that the motive behind the Jewish emigration is not humanitarian but primarily political, aimed at providing Israel with the massive human potential that will enable it to achieve a combination of military superiority and great population density and, thereby, to win the race of force in which it has been engaged since its inception in the region and to persist unhindered in its aggressive policy against the Palestinian people and Arab States.

Thus the gravity of this question no longer brooks delay. The Israeli plans to settle the Jewish immigrants in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories have now become clear. They have been embodied in Shamir's statements to the effect that such a large-scale immigration necessitates the establishment of "Greater Israel". The misgivings engendered by the positions taken and statements made by Zionist and Israeli leaders are no mere hyperbole: unfortunately, they are all-too real. If we consider the historical facts of the successive Jewish immigrations to occupied Palestine since the early years of this century we find a close relationship between immigration and settlement on Palestinian land. Successive Zionist schemes have played a fundamental role in attracting Jews from all over the world to transform Palestine into a homeland for them.

It is curious that this horrendous crime should be perpetrated against the Palestinian people on the pretext of human rights and mankind's right to travel

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

and to emigrate. Is it at all fair to invoke the human right to emigrate and travel for certain groups of people at the expense of others who are the rightful owners of the land in question? The new Jewish immigrants will inevitably displace the indigenous population, who will be forced to emigrate to other areas as were those Palestinians who were forced to leave their homeland in 1948 and 1967, turned into refugees and displaced in exile and diaspora.

Israel's settlements policy is systematic and has been firmly entrenched in the platforms of successive Israeli Governments. Since its inception Israel has been nibbling at and annexing occupied Palestinian and Arab territories and displacing their indigenous populations while at the same time continuing to import ever-larger numbers of Jewish immigrants from the far corners of the globe into the occupied Arab territories on a massive scale as settlers and simultaneously denying hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees and displaced persons the right to return to their land and their country. The occupied Palestinian territories are limited in size. The more Jews that Israel and world Zionism can attract from all over the world, the more Israel will tighten its grip on the remaining Palestinians and the more it will then bar the doors to the Palestinian refugees and displaced persons in diaspora and exile.

The persistence of this systematic scheme to settle thousands of Jews in the occupied Palestinian territories is utterly incompatible with the peace efforts of the international community. The establishment of settlements of new immigrants in the occupied territories constitutes a cynical disregard of those peace efforts, of the resolutions of the Security Council and of the international will. In addition, such action has grave repercussions on the prospects for peace and stability in the region as a whole and creates further impediments to a comprehensive, just settlement of the Arab-Israeli struggle. Thus, the

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

responsibility for putting an end to the growing Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and other States is an international one and must be shouldered by the international community and, in particular, by the Security Council.

In view of those facts, we feel that the Security Council should deal with the risk created by the influx of massive numbers of Soviet and East European Jews to the Palestinian territories and stand firm against the Israeli schemes designed to thwart peace efforts, the implementation of United Nations resolutions and the provisions of international law with regard to the situation in the Middle East and the rights of the Palestinian people, especially their right to self-determination and to establish an independent State on their national soil. In the face of the risks inherent in the immigration, we can no longer accept that the Security Council should delay further, for Israel's settlements policy affects the essence of the peace process in the Middle East and goes against Security Council resolutions, particularly resolutions 242 (1967) and 465 (1980).

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

Those two resolutions affirm the inadmissibility of the acquisition of the territory of others by force and the illegitimacy of establishing settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories; they consider such settlements null and void, as settlement and immigration are blatant violations of international norms and agreements, foremost among which is the fourth Geneva Convention, the Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 1949, especially its Article 49, which prohibits the immigration and settlement of an alien population in the occupied territories.

My delegation feels that the Council's international duty and responsibility require it to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the systematic Israeli settlements scheme, which is thwarting peace efforts. Jewish immigration and expansion to include the occupied Palestinian territories are a growing danger, as they serve an Israeli strategy inimical to peace, based on aborting any prospects of achieving peace. This is an entrenched strategy which has remained unchanged and was affirmed by Shamir's declaration regarding the so-called Greater Israel through the influx of more Jewish immigrants and settlement in the occupied Palestinian territories.

To regard the immigration as having a humanitarian dimension is to exploit truth in the promotion of injustice, since the political and military dimensions of the immigration have been disregarded, although they give military and human support for the Israeli military potential. They also affect the demographic structure of the territories.

What gives rise to suspicion is the fact that the flow of Jewish emigration from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is taking place while some Western Powers that have brought pressure to bear on the Soviet Union and the States of Eastern Europe over many years to allow their citizens to emigrate are putting obstacles in

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

the way of Jews who wish to emigrate to them, thus preventing their entering this or that Western country.

Jewish emigration, the erection of barriers to Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union, limiting the choice of their destination and where they will reside, closing the door to their immigration to Western countries and the continued financial support by some States for Israel's settler-colonial schemes - all of this is a crime against the Palestinian people. The massive emigration from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will inevitably be matched by a forcible displacement of the Palestinian people from their land and country. This will also support Israel's continuous rejection of United Nations resolutions calling for the return of the Palestinians displaced from their homeland.

Therefore, we feel it is imperative to open the doors to the immigration of Soviet Jews into Western countries in order to accommodate the large numbers of Jewish emigrants who would rather settle in the United States and Western Europe.

The opposition of some major Powers to the settlement of Soviet Jews and others in the occupied Palestinian territories needs to be translated into concrete terms if it is to be credible at a time when the doors of emigration are still open and those States continue their financial support for Israel. To argue that Jewish immigrants will not settle in the Arab territories occupied in 1967 is baseless and unacceptable. The settlers of whom the Israeli leaders boast have spread like a cancer in the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967. Israel did not ask any of the major Powers for their permission to establish those settlements. Since its inception Israel has been annexing Arab territories, parcel by parcel, and has not honoured its commitments to the international community and the United Nations.

The continued Jewish immigration has led to support for Israeli extremism and the erection of further obstacles to a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

struggle, as was clearly reflected in the recent Israeli stance regarding peace initiatives.

Needless to say, the Israeli-Arab conflict is primarily over land and recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to its land and country. The systematic Jewish immigration into occupied Palestine was, and still is, a brutal act of aggression against the Palestinian people. Moreover, since the beginning the successive Zionist immigration schemes have had a settler-colonialist basis aimed at usurping the land and expelling the Palestinian people.

The Jewish immigration from all corners of the world into occupied Palestine and the settlement of the Jews concerned in the occupied Palestinian territories is taking place today under the pretext of human rights, including the right to travel and emigrate. Therefore, we must wonder about the right of the Palestinian people to its occupied territories and the right to return of the Palestinian refugees who have been expelled and displaced from their homeland by force and terrorism. Humanitarian solutions to human rights questions should not be brought about at the expense of other peoples and their genuine, inalienable right to self-determination, to return and to exercise their sovereignty on their national soil.

Attempts by Israel and others to bypass those rights are completely unacceptable and illegal, as is affirmed by United Nations resolutions and international legitimacy; such attempts are unethical acts, incompatible with the claim to seek a just peace in the Middle East and with the ethical responsibility that the major Powers are supposed to shoulder in regard to an invasion and the expulsion of a people from its homeland to be displaced by aliens.

In view of those facts, the Security Council needs to translate into concrete terms an understanding of Arab and Palestinian misgivings about the flow of Jewish immigrants and to go beyond expressing sympathy to take action contributing to a

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

serious treatment of the problem, since the right of the Palestinians to live in peace and stability on their own land cannot be abrogated in favour of the Jewish immigration, which is the Jewish mechanism exploited by Israel to make changes in the demographic structure in the occupied territories at the expense of their rightful owners. Israel also exploits that immigration in the service of its military machine and to finance and strengthen its designs for expansion and aggression to seize the territories and change their occupation into a fait accompli.

In that context, we hope that the Security Council will be seized of the potentially grave dimensions of the Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories, especially since there is not a glimmer of hope in the short term that Israel will change its settlement policies and schemes. Therefore, such policies and schemes will severely damage the rights of the Palestinians.

In view of those facts, we hope that the Security Council will effectively and seriously put an end to Israel's cynical disregard of its resolutions. The massive new Jewish immigration to Palestine and the settlements there constitute a new challenge, in view of whose gravity the Security Council must not stand idly by.

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

The Security Council has repeatedly condemned Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, in resolutions 446 (1979), 452 (1979) and others, affirming the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and prohibiting the occupier from settling immigrants in the occupied territories, including the Holy City of Al-Quds, since such settlements are a blatant violation of international norms and agreements, especially the Fourth Geneva Convention.

Given the need to respect Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, we call upon the Security Council and the major Powers fully to shoulder their responsibilities and secure respect for the human rights of the populations of the occupied Arab territories, including respect for the rights of the Palestinians, and to prevent any immigration on the pretext of respecting the right to travel and to emigrate while the human rights of the Palestinians, the legitimate heirs to the land, are disregarded.

Bahrain hopes that the current debate in the Security Council on this grave question will lead to the adoption of a strong decision commensurate with the seriousness of the situation with regard to this process of emigration and settlement that will put an end to it by placing all the parties concerned before their ethical, humanitarian and political responsibilities, so that the fundamental basic rights of the Palestinians to their land and country are not undermined. Procrastination is no longer acceptable, given the risks inherent in such immigration that call upon this lofty Council to put an end to the threat of settler-colonialism of Jewish immigrants in occupied Palestinian territories. Yes, a strong and firm resolution is needed, one that will thwart Israel's expansionist schemes and include deterrent measures under Chapter VII of the Charter should Israel refuse to abide by the will of the international community, which is opposed to the settlement of new immigrants in the occupied Palestinian territories, and one that is compatible with the dictates of right, justice and human rights for the

(Mr. Al-Shakar, Bahrain)

Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples whose territories are occupied, or those threatened with expansion and aggression in the context of Israel's expansionist schemes aimed at massive displacement of the Palestinian people.

The Security Council's adoption of necessary measures to prevent the settlement of Jewish immigrants and civilians in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories will enhance the Council's credibility and its resolutions, especially since the quickening pace of events suggests that delaying the adoption of such measures will affect the peace process and stability in the region and, hence, expose it to incalculable consequences difficult to contain.

We are awaiting proof of the Council's credibility when it is a question of ensuring Israel's compliance with its resolutions - resolutions embodying the will of the international community.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Bahrain for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. I. A. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh): The Council is once again focused on a problem whose resolution has been far too long in coming. The pains of Palestine still persist, just as they have for decades. But today more than ever before the issue threatens to rip apart the fabric of peace so laboriously knitted in our times. Must we stand helplessly by and allow this to happen?

But before I proceed any further, Mr. President, I should be derelict in my responsibilities if I did not adequately express my delegation's pride and satisfaction at seeing you in the Chair - pride, because our two brotherly countries share the closest ties; satisfaction, because your prodigious capabilities are likely to bring success to our deliberations. We must also commend the splendid leadership Cuba imparted to the Council last month.

(Mr. I. A. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

Much of the events unfolding in the world today are being perceived positively. We have a great deal to rejoice about. Tensions everywhere are easing. Yokes of domination are being lifted. Hatchets are being buried. We see all around us the triumph of human rights. Where the hawks of war once soared, the doves of peace fly. But amidst all this, there is one region where sufferings continue unabated. There the cries of freedom are stifled by the jangle of prison chains - I speak of Palestine.

This incongruity is a sad commentary upon our age. The Palestinian does not share with others the burgeoning sense of euphoria and exultation. He does not know the taste of freedom. He must sacrifice his rights, so that others are able to obtain theirs. To him this bitter logic must seem a fallacy of gargantuan proportions.

Is it odd, therefore, that he should react by resisting? The intifadah has been his response. It is many things. It is not just a reaction to persecution, though it is also that, but a product of pride, of human dignity. It is the expression of the desire of the Palestinians to build a future for themselves. There is no vengeance inherent in the intifadah, nor the intention to deny others the same aspiration. The world cannot begrudge them this thirst for freedom.

It is bad enough to be denied basic human rights. It is unfair enough to be punished for daring to speak out. It is worse to be thrown out of your lands and homes to make room for others. It is more than illogical, it is inhuman, to explain this away as a humanitarian act. The world cannot, must not, condone the settlement of Soviet Jewish immigrants in the occupied Arab territories. Such selective humnitarianism will sow the seeds not just of perennial discord but also of the grossest injustice.

This is wrong on many counts. First, the exercise of right by a group of people should not be at the expense of another. Secondly, this is a flagrant

(Mr. I. A. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

violation of prevalent mores, the Fourth Geneva Convention and fundamental human rights. Thirdly, it will undermine the peace process and jeopardize all efforts undertaken in that respect so far. Finally, it will forever become a source of friction between the two concerned communities. To have us believe that all this is being done purely to advance humanitarian interests is to do unspeakable violence to our intelligence. Surely, Israel cannot turn a blind eye to the writing on the wall and a deaf ear to the voice of reason. In a swiftly changing world, the changelessness of Tel Aviv's obduracy is a sad anomaly.

For a myriad of reasons, the issue of Palestine is close to any Bangladeshi heart. Bangladesh is an active member of the Non-Aligned Committee of Nine on Palestine. Like most others, Bangladeshis want a comprehensive, just and durable solution to what is the core problem of the Middle East. This can only be on the basis of full recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. We ask nothing more for the Palestinians than what we see many other peoples achieving even now. Israel must withdraw from all occupied Arab territories. The Palestinians must have an unfettered right to a State in what has been, is and will always be their home. Such a solution is possible only if the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), participates in the peace process on an equal footing with other concerned parties.

The Security Council has a crucial role in this. We urge the members to proceed to the preparations for convening the international peace conference on the basis of the Council's resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

None of this will be possible unless the settlement of the Jewish immigrants in the occupied territories ceases. We appeal to all parties that this be done forthwith.

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

That fragile situation, where a proverbial straw could break the camel's back, will not be able to withstand the weight of such injustice.

Palestine belongs to the Palestinians. They must be allowed to call it home. Till such time as they can do so, peace cannot, will not, come to the Middle East. And we, the global community, cannot, will not, be immune from the consequent blame.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Bangladesh for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NYAKYI (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation for the opportunity to address the Council on this important subject. I should like to thank you and your colleagues on the Council for making this possible.

To address the Council at any time is a great privilege. To do so while its deliberations are under your guidance is a matter of particular pleasure for my delegation. Allow me therefore to begin my remarks by extending to you Tanzania's sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. We share the confidence expressed by previous speakers that your well known diplomatic skills and experience will ensure a successful presidency.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the tact, understanding and sensitivity with which your predecessor, Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, presided over the business of the Council for the month of February.

The winds of freedom which have swept across many parts of the world in the past year, and which have so dramatically changed the political landscape of Europe during the last six months, have yet to reach the Middle East. There, the

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

Arab-Israeli problem, and particularly its root cause, the continued denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, especially their inalienable right to self-determination and to an independent State of their own, remains intractable. The reason the Council is meeting today is not because the situation has been improving in keeping with the spirit and mood of the moment. The contrary has been the case. The intifadah continues relentlessly as a constant reminder that Palestinians will no longer accept their daily humiliation and oppression. The fact that the detention of more than 100,000 Palestinians since the intifadah began has not been able to subdue the uprising tells us something about the resolve of the Palestinians to resist oppression. After 22 years of occupation, they are saying "Enough is enough".

It is ironic that the Council, which should have been meeting to advance the various plans intended to put an end to this intolerable situation and to advance a comprehensive and lasting peace settlement of the Middle East problem, is now being called upon to address a new problem which amounts to adding insult to injury.

We applaud the decision of the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate. This is an act which enhances human freedom. Under normal circumstances, it would be a development which should be the cause for rejoicing for the whole of humanity. It is ironic that this act of freedom has been the cause of much anguish and anxiety, not just in the Middle East but in many places around the world where people are still yearning for freedom. For the freedom of a people should enhance the freedom of all humanity and inspire the struggles of those still fighting for their own freedom.

The Council has been convened to discuss Israel's decision to settle immigrant Soviet Jews in occupied Palestinian territory which Israel holds in flagrant violation of international law and numerous resolutions of the United Nations. It

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

is an act which provides further proof, if proof were at all needed, of Israel's intransigence and contempt not only for its Arab neighbours but also for the international community as a whole.

The international community cannot and does not question the right of Israel to accept migrant Jews. Those migrant Jews wishing, of their own free will, to settle in Israel should be allowed to do so. It is their right. But that right should not be taken by Israel to be a licence for the annexation of occupied Palestinian and Arab lands. Yet this is precisely what Israel's action in not only allowing but encouraging immigrant Jews to settle on occupied Palestinian lands amounts to. It is an attempt by Israel to grant immigrant Jews rights which entail the trampling underfoot of the rights of the Palestinian people. No one people should be allowed to infringe on another peoples right's, on whatever grounds.

Israel is seeking to justify its latest policy on the grounds that the new arrivals should have the right to settle in any place of their choice. We have no quarrel with this. But that right cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be interpreted to mean the right to settle on lands other than those within the internationally recognized boundaries of Israel. To allow Israel to get away with this is to acquiesce in actions that carry with them the danger of placing the international community in league with an occupying Power. This, needless to say, is totally unacceptable. It would be a negation of the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council's role as the principal organ for the maintenance of world peace and security. Yet inaction on the part of the international community can have no other interpretation or outcome. If the United Nations does not proceed to take action effectively to bring home to Israel its rejection of this condemnable act, it will find itself faced with with a fait accompli which seriously undermines United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and

(Mr. Nyakyi, United Republic of Tanzania)

338 (1973), through which the international community has for years been seeking to resolve the Middle East question.

It has been pointed out in the past that inaction or half-hearted action by the Council has tended to place its credibility in jeopardy. Situations such as these do little to enhance it. So let the Council be seen to act decisively to thwart this latest violation of the will of the international community by leaving Israel in no doubt whatsoever about its outrage over these actions. Let the Council go beyond condemning this latest show of defiance by a Member whose record of observing international norms of behaviour has been consistently contemptuous. Let the Council ensure that for once Israel is made to respect the will of the international community.

Tanzania applauds the resolve of the Palestinian people to face up to the military might of Israel. We condemn unreservedly the continued illegal occupation of Palestinian and Arab lands. We call on the world to demand an immediate end to the occupation and to the latest flagrant acts of aggression committed against the Palestinian people. We call upon the friends and backers of Israel to bring home to Israel that this time they have gone too far and that unless they relent they should expect no protection from the wrath of the world community.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue its consideration of the item on its agenda will take place tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.